

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/675,014	Applicant(s) LONGSDORF ET AL.	
	Examiner CHARLES R. KASENGE	Art Unit 2121	

All Participants:

(1) CHARLES R. KASENGE.

(2) Judson K. Champlin.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 June 2009

Time: 1:30 pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

102(b)

Claims discussed:

1, 32, 46, 52 and 53

Prior art documents discussed:

Drahm et al. U.S. Patent 6,662,120

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The attorney of record agreed to the changes illustrated in the Examiner's amendment to overcome a 102(b) rejection with the Drahm reference (col. 2, lines 26-44). Changes were also made to resolve minor informalities and 112 2nd issues.

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Charles R Kasenge/
Examiner, Art Unit 2121

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)